

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 18 have been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Set forth in paragraph 104 is a case where the generation of a distributed image by decimating a portion of the framed image is described. Using this technique, it is possible to obtain the relative picture quality value of the distributed image with respect to the master image based on the number of frames that are used as to code the information. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits the description of paragraph 104 supports claim 8 and the specification is enabling with respect to claim 8. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 11, 13-14, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (U.S. 7,076,103 B2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 as amended is as follows:

An image processing apparatus comprising:  
an image expansion unit to expand image compressed code and to output an expanded image data, the image compressed code is obtained by compressing a master image data;  
an image display unit to display an image of the expanded image data on a display unit;  
a picture quality judging unit to judge relative picture quality of the expanded image data with respect to a picture quality of the master image data, based on compressed data of the image compressed code and expansion of the image compressed code, and to output picture quality information indicating the relative picture quality; and  
an image information display unit to display the picture quality information on the display unit.

As set forth above, in claim 1, the present invention as claimed requires determining the relative picture quality of expanded image data with respect to the picture quality of master image data based on compressed data of the image compressed code where the determination of relative picture quality is performed after the expanded image data has been generated. Applicant respectfully submits these features are not shown in Yamada.

Yamada discloses recognizing a degree of image quality degradation when image data is compressed. At the time of compressing the image data, compression information is added as tag information into a file header. By referring to this compression information not the compressed data in the file or stream, the compression history of the compressed image data can be registered to the degree of image quality degradation of the image data obtained by decompressing the compressed image can be known.

In contrast, claim 1 makes a determination of relative picture quality of an expanded image data based on compressed data in the image compressed code, not just data in a header that is attached to compressed data. In other words, Yamada recognizes or determines a degree of image quality at the time the image data is compressed, while in the present invention as claimed, the determination of image quality is not performed until after the expansion is performed and is performed using compressed data. Note that the present invention as claimed is not limited to the sole use of compressed data as part of the determination of image quality; however, the determination is based at least on some compressed data in the image compressed code. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits the present invention as claimed is not anticipated by Yamada.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-10, 12, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For the same reasons given above with respect to the rejection under § 102(e), Applicant respectfully submits the present invention

as claimed is not obvious in view of Yamada, as Yamada does not disclose all limitations of the present invention as claimed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 9-10, 12, 17, and 19 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in further view of Skodras et al and ISO/IEC 15444-1 and 15444-3 (Motion JPEG). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As set forth above, while Yamada does not disclose determining relative picture quality between an expanded image data and master image data based on compressed data in an image code after the expansion of the compressed image data has occurred. Skodras is focused on file formats and not on determining relative picture quality based on compressed image data. Applicant respectfully submits that Skodras does not overcome the limitations in Yamada. Therefore, the combination of Yamada and Skodras does not include all the limitations of the claim. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Yamada and Skodras.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to the claims and the abstract have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that Claims 1-19 as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9/25/07

By:   
Michael J. Mallie  
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(408) 720-8300